

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 were examined by the Office, and in the Office Action of May 7, 2007 all claims are rejected. With this response no claims are amended, added or cancelled. Applicant respectfully requests correction of the Office Action, and that the period for reply be reset for the following reasons.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Office responds to applicant's previously submitted arguments by stating that Osano (U.S. Patent No. 6,961,591) discloses a first contact connected to ground and to an antenna input of a radio receiver, while applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion for at least the reasons presented in applicant's previous response, the Office further asserts that Ramsey discloses a band-pass filter component is interconnected between the first contact and radio receiver on page 3 of the Office Action. Ramsey was not applied in the previous Office Action, and it is unclear whether the Office means to cite Ramsey, Osano or Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,430,217) in responding to applicant's arguments.

Furthermore, in rejecting the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Osano or Suzuki, the Office states on page 5 of the Office Action that Ramsey discloses wherein a band-pass filter component is interconnected between the first contact and radio receiver. Again, it is unclear whether this is a typographical error and the Office intends to rely upon either Osano or Suzuki, or if the Office intends to rely upon Ramsey but has not introduced Ramsey in the rejection of the claims.

Accordingly, applicant cannot respond to the rejections of the present Office Action due to the inconsistencies identified above. Therefore, in accordance with MPEP § 707.05(g) applicant respectfully requests that the Office correct the errors in the Office Action of May 7, 2007, and restart the period for reply.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

To the extent that the rejections of the present Office Action are the same as those of the previous Office Action, applicant responds to the rejections by reiterating the arguments presented with applicants previous response filed February 8, 2007.

Conclusion

The rejections of the Office Action having been shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested, and passage to issue of the present application is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge deposit account 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6 August 2007



Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

KRO/kas
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
Customer No. 004955